

June, 1992

Corrections to the Electroweak Effective Action at Finite Temperature*

C. Glenn Boyd[†]

Enrico Fermi Institute, 5640 Ellis Ave., Chicago IL 60637

David E. Brahm[‡]

Caltech 452-48, Pasadena CA 91125

and

Stephen D.H. Hsu[§]

Lyman Laboratory of Physics, Harvard University, Cambridge MA 02138

Abstract

We calculate contributions to the finite temperature effective action for the electroweak phase transition (EWPT) at $\mathcal{O}(g^4)$, *i.e.* at second orders in $(g^2 T^2 / \mathcal{M}^2)$. This requires plasma-mass corrections in the calculation of the effective potential, inclusion of the “lollipop” diagram corrections. We find the EWPT remains too weakly first-order to drive baryogenesis. We calculate some one loop kinetic energy corrections using diagrammatic methods; these may be important for saddlepoint configurations such as the bounce or sphaleron.

*This work was supported by the Director, Office of Energy Research, Office of High Energy and Nuclear Physics, Division of High Energy Physics of the U.S. Department of Energy under contracts DEAC-03-81ER40050 and DEFG-02-90ER40560.

[†]Email: boyd@rabi.uchicago.edu

[‡]Email: brahm@theory3.caltech.edu

[§]Junior Fellow, Harvard Society of Fellows. Email: hsu@hsunext.harvard.edu

1 Introduction

Recent work [1, 2] suggests the baryon asymmetry may have been generated at the electroweak phase transition (EWPT). This would require the transition be first-order [3], with the resulting Higgs vev large (roughly, $\phi_+(T_b)/T_b > 1.4$). Several authors [1, 4], using the 1-loop finite temperature effective potential [5, 6, 7], have concluded that these requirements may be met in the Standard Model (with augmented CP violation) for a sufficiently light Higgs, say $M_h < 55 \text{ GeV}$ (now just below experimental limits [8]).

Since the transition is weakly first-order, infrared divergences [9] from the resultant nearly massless scalar and gauge boson modes make higher-loop graphs important. The inclusion of plasma masses [10, 11] accounts for the most important corrections, $\mathcal{O}(g^2 T^2/\mathcal{M}^2)$, while all other higher-loop corrections are $\mathcal{O}(g^2 T/\mathcal{M})$ [12]. Several authors have examined plasma mass corrections in the gauge sector [12, 13, 14, 15]; while we will refine these calculations, the basic result holds that electric modes decouple [15], reducing the cubic term in V by 1/3. For the Higgs sector Carrington [14] computed the leading plasma masses [$\mathcal{O}(g^2 T^2)$ and $\mathcal{O}(\lambda T^2)$], and Brahm and Hsu [12] worked to higher order in g . Unfortunately, the vacuum-to-vacuum method we used overcounts some contributions, as pointed out by the authors of ref. [15] and by Boyd; in this paper we re-examine the Higgs sector using tadpole graphs.

One may question the validity of inserting zero-momentum plasma masses into our diagrams [16]; we estimate the error involved using the derivative expansion of the effective action [17], and also by direct calculation of a two point graph. We note derivative terms can be important for determining critical bubbles or (B+L)-violating sphaleron solutions [18], and resolving questions of gauge-invariance.

2 The 1-loop effective potential

The effective action $\Gamma[\bar{\phi}]$ is the double Legendre transform of the generator of 1PI truncated Green's functions, and is the Legendre transform of $W[J]$:

$$\Gamma[\bar{\phi}] = W[J] - \int d^4x J(x) \bar{\phi}(x), \quad (2.1)$$

where $\bar{\phi}$ is the expectation value of the field operator ϕ in the presence of J . The quantum theory described by $W[J]$ is equivalent to the theory described by $\Gamma[\bar{\phi}]$, which can be expanded as

$$\Gamma[\bar{\phi}] = \int d^4x [-V(\bar{\phi}) + A(\bar{\phi}) \bar{\phi} + \dots]$$

On the restricted Hilbert space of states localized in the region where the potential [19, 20].

At finite (non-zero) temperature, V can be calculated by summing over (anti-periodic) boundary conditions on bosonic (fermionic) fields. For $k_4^2 \rightarrow \omega_n^2 = (2\pi nT)^2$ and $\int \frac{d^4k}{(2\pi)^4} \rightarrow T \sum_n \int \frac{d^3k}{(2\pi)^3}$ (integer) for bosons (fermions) [5, 6, 21, 22]. V can be written as the sum of tree-level, $T=0$, and finite- T corrections.

$$V = V_0 + V_1 + V_T, \quad V_0(\phi) = \frac{\lambda}{4} \phi^4$$

where $\lambda = M_h^2/2v^2$. At any order, a useful approximation is

$$V = D(T^2 - T_0^2) \bar{\phi}^2 - ET \bar{\phi}^4$$

where T_0 is the temperature at which $V''(\bar{\phi}) = 0$. This approximation can be used to estimate quantities such as T_c , the temperature of the two degenerate minima, and $\bar{\phi}_+$, the position of the minimum.

We add counterterms [4] to V_1 to maintain the relation $\Sigma(M_h^2) + \Sigma(0) = 0$ at $T = 0$. The latter relation is satisfied by vanishing external momentum while the physical mass is M_h^2 ($p^2 = M_h^2$) [23]; it is accounted for by “running” the mass.

$$V_1 = \frac{\Delta\lambda}{4} (\bar{\phi}^2 - v^2)^2 + \sum_j \frac{\pm g_j}{64\pi^2} \left\{ m_j^4 \ln \left[\frac{m_j^2}{\Lambda^2} \right] \right.$$

where

$$\Delta\lambda = \frac{-1}{2v^2} \sum_j [\Sigma_j(M_h^2) - \Sigma_j(0)] \equiv \sum_j \frac{g_j}{16\pi^2} \left(\frac{M_h^2}{m_j^2} - 1 \right)$$

The sums are over all particles j with g_j degrees of freedom and mass $m_j(\phi)$; we write $M_j = m_j(v)$. The upper sign is for bosons, the lower for fermions. The Standard Model fields in Landau gauge [1, 4, 24] are the Higgs ($g_h = 1$), the Goldstone bosons ($g_\chi = 3$), the top quark ($g_t = 12$), and the gauge bosons ($g_W = 6, g_Z = 3$), with tree-level masses

$$m_h^2 = \lambda(3\phi^2 - v^2), \quad m_\chi^2 = \lambda(\phi^2 - v^2), \quad m_t = \frac{M_t \phi}{v}, \quad m_W = \frac{g\phi}{2}, \quad m_Z = \frac{G\phi}{2} \quad (2.7)$$

where $G^2 = g^2 + g'^2$.

In Appendix A we give the running functions $f_j(r)$ defined in eq. (2.6). Note the Goldstone bosons, massless in Landau gauge for $\bar{\phi} = v$, contribute a logarithmic infinity to $\Sigma(0)$ and thus to $\Delta\lambda$, which exactly cancels the infinity in the $\ln[m_\chi^2/M_\chi^2]$ term.

The T -dependent part of the effective potential is [5, 6, 21, 22]

$$V_T = g_j \frac{T^4}{2\pi^2} I_\pm(m_j/T), \quad I_\pm(y) \equiv \pm \int_0^\infty dx x^2 \ln \left(1 \mp e^{-\sqrt{x^2+y^2}} \right) \quad (2.8)$$

Series expansions of $I_\pm$ can be found in Appendix B. The ϕ^3 term arising from gauge boson loops is primarily responsible for the hump in the potential [1, 4, 25].

The Higgs and Goldstone masses can make imaginary contributions to V . For homogeneous field configurations, these represent the rate of decay to inhomogeneous states [20]. We speculate that for the critical bubble they are canceled (at least in large part) by derivative corrections [26]. The critical bubble has only one negative eigenmode (the “breathing” mode), whose contribution to the imaginary part of the action appears to be independent of the bubble radius R in the thin-wall limit, whereas the imaginary parts of V would contribute $\sim R^2$ to the action if uncanceled. It is also very suggestive that the region in which the integrand of eq. (2.8) is complex ($x < |y|$, or $k < |m|$) arises from Fourier modes of ϕ with wavelengths larger than the bubble wall thickness [26, 27]. We eliminate these modes by taking the real part of V_1 and changing the lower limit of integration in eq. (2.8) to $\text{Im}\{y\}$.

In the tadpole method [25, 28], $V'(\bar{\phi})$ is calculated from tadpole graphs using Feynman rules in the shifted theory $\phi = \bar{\phi} + \phi'$, dropping linear terms in ϕ' which are canceled in the Legendre transform relating $W[J]$ and $\Gamma[\bar{\phi}]$ [eq. (2.1)]

Figure 1: Loop Diagram

[29, 21]. The 1-loop diagrams are shown in Fig

$$\begin{aligned} V' &= (\lambda + \Delta\lambda)\bar{\phi}(\bar{\phi}^2 - v^2) \\ &+ \sum_j \frac{\pm g_j}{32\pi^2} \frac{dm_j^2}{d\bar{\phi}} \left\{ \tilde{m}_j^2 \left(\ln \left[\frac{\tilde{m}_j^2}{\tilde{m}_j^2} \right] \right) \right. \\ &+ \left. \sum_j \frac{g_j T^2}{24} \frac{dm_j^2}{d\bar{\phi}} F_\pm \left(\frac{\tilde{m}}{T} \right) \right\} \end{aligned}$$

where $F_\pm(y) \equiv 6I'_\pm(y)/(\pi^2 y)$.

3 Higher order corrections

Beyond one loop, the most important diagrams are daisies and super-daisies, as well as one other, the lollipop (Fig. 1e).

Consider the W tadpole (first diagram of Fig. 1a), which contributes $\sim (gT^2M)$ to V' , where $M \sim g\bar{\phi}$. “Daisies” [5] (Fig. 1b,c) are diagrams with loops on the main W loop; those in Fig. 1b contribute $\sim (gT^2M)(g^2T^2/M^2)^n(g^2T/M)$. If we ignore powers of $T/\bar{\phi}$, daisies are $\mathcal{O}(g^3)$. “Super-daisies” (Fig. 1d) contribute $\sim (gT^2M)(g^2T^2/M^2)^n(g^2T/M)^2$, and are $\mathcal{O}(g^4)$ corrections. While many other diagrams exist which cannot be classified as daisies or super-daisies (Fig. 1e,f), only the “lollipop” (Fig. 1e) is $\mathcal{O}(g^4)$. In the region of interest $(g^2T^2/M^2) \approx 1$ and $(g^2T/M) < 1$ [6], so we make a consistent approximation by considering super-daisy diagrams and the lollipop. In the Higgs sector the same categorization holds by replacing $g^2 \rightarrow \lambda$.

We emphasize that the convergence properties of the loop expansion depend on the choice of $\bar{\phi}$ as well as T . For a given temperature T , the expansion may fail [$(g^2T/M) \geq 1$] at some particular values of $\bar{\phi}$ due to uncontrolled IR divergences, while remaining good at other values of $\bar{\phi}$. A complete $\mathcal{O}(g^4)$ calculation allows us to explore larger values of $T/\bar{\phi}$, while a partial calculation serves as an indicator of the reliability of our expansion.

Progress towards our goal is achieved by modifying the propagators D , as in Fig. 2. The largest $\mathcal{O}(g^3)$ corrections are mass renormalizations, and are incorporated by replacing $\tilde{m}$ in eq. (2.9) with plasma masses [11]. Working to $\mathcal{O}(g^4)$ requires a self-consistent solution of the mass gap equations. These are not the whole story, however, since we calculated the plasma masses at vanishing external momenta. Wavefunction renormalization and the momentum dependence of the plasma masses must also be included. We plan to address these non-static corrections in a future publication [30], but make all effective potential calculations in this paper with self energies evaluated at $\omega_n = 0$ and three-momenta $\mathbf{k} = 0$.

To put the various corrections in perspective, we estimate their contributions to the effective potential terms D,E, and λ_T , as well as to a “pseudo-linear” term J, valid only when the tree mass is larger than the static plasma mass. Since daisy and super-daisy contributions are summed by mass renormalizations

	J
1-loop	0
Daisy ($\rho T^2 < \bar{\phi}^2$)	g^3
Daisy ($\rho T^2 > \bar{\phi}^2$)	0
Super-Daisy ($\rho T^2 < \bar{\phi}^2$)	g^5
Super-Daisy ($\rho T^2 > \bar{\phi}^2$)	0
Lollipop	0
$\omega_n \neq 0$ ($\rho T^2 < \bar{\phi}^2$)	g^3
$\omega_n \neq 0$ ($\rho T^2 > \bar{\phi}^2$)	0
$\omega_n = 0, \mathbf{k} \neq 0$	0

*Suppressed by power

Table 1: Order of Contribution

(valid at the tadpole level in the imaginary time formalism, where the propagator goes like $(k^2 + m^2)^{-1}$), we schematically insert $\tilde{m} \rightarrow m_p$ into eq. (2.9), expand $F(\frac{\tilde{m}}{T})$ using Appendix E, and sum over $\mathbf{k}$ and ω_n terms (see Table 1). The terms involving ρ also involve σ terms (see Table 1). The terms involving σ come from super-daisies (and sub-

The largest correction comes from daisies. The introduction of an infrared cutoff eliminates the divergence in the tadpole graph. The plasma mass of the W longitudinal mode is $m_p \sim gT$, while the Higgs plasma mass falls between the

All of this is for static self energies. We calculate the self energy of gauge bosons in unrenormalized theories, for the self energy of gauge bosons at nonzero frequency $\omega_n \neq 0$, or nonzero three-momenta $\mathbf{k} \neq 0$. A typical correction is a self energy contribution

$$\begin{aligned}
V' &\sim g^2 \bar{\phi} T \sum_n \int \frac{d^3 \mathbf{k}}{(2\pi)^3} [\omega_n^2 (1 + \frac{\mathbf{k}^2}{\omega_n^2})^{-1}] \\
&\sim g^2 \bar{\phi} \int_m^T \frac{d^3 k}{\omega_0} F_{\omega_0} \\
&\sim g^2 T^2 \bar{\phi} + \rho g^3 \bar{\phi} T^3 (\rho T^2 + \bar{\phi}^2)^{-1}
\end{aligned}$$

Figure 2: Improved Propagators

where $\omega_0^2 = (k^2 + m^2)/(1 + g^2 T^2 \frac{\rho}{k^2})$, and for purposes of power counting, F_x (defined in Appendix C) $\sim T/x$. For the table, we have assumed an expansion in $\frac{m}{T}$. In general, the non-static part of a tadpole is as important as the static part. However, in the unbroken theory with $\omega_n = 0$ (only $\omega_n = 0$ contributes to E), the coefficient of $\mathbf{k}^2$ is down by $\sim \frac{1}{\pi^2}$ relative to the coefficient of T^2 , suggesting that $\bar{\phi}_+/T_c$ is not significantly altered by non-static terms. This contrasts with some recent claims [32].

4 The gauge sector

To first approximation $\mathcal{M} = m_W = g\bar{\phi}/2$, so without propagator modification the loop expansion fails for $\bar{\phi} < T$, which is unacceptable. We solve the gap equation of Fig. 2a to obtain both electric and magnetic plasma masses for the W. It is known [33] that for $\bar{\phi} = 0$, to leading order the magnetic plasma mass vanishes, so we write

$$\Pi_0^0 = \rho_0 g^2 T^2 + \sigma_0 g^2 m_W T + \mathcal{O}(g^4 T^2), \quad \Pi_i^i = \sigma_i g^2 T m_W + \mathcal{O}(g^4 T^2). \quad (4.1)$$

Figure 3: Linear Term Tadpole,

and solve

$$m_0 = \sqrt{m_W^2 + \Pi_0^0}, \quad m_i =$$

The terms neglected (such as contributions of $\omega_n \neq 0$) are suppressed by powers of g, λ , or $(\mathcal{M}/T)$. This procedure y

$$m_0 = \frac{1}{2} \left[\sigma_0 g^2 T + \sqrt{(4\rho_0 g^2 + \sigma_0^2) T^2} \right]$$

$$m_i = \frac{1}{2} \left[\sigma_i g^2 T + \sqrt{\sigma_i^2 g^4 T^2} \right]$$

We calculate ρ_0 , σ_0 , and σ_i to 1-loop for the but we will only use the result for $\sin \theta_w = \lambda =$

$$\rho_0 = 11/6, \quad \sigma_0 = -5/(4\pi),$$

We will treat the Z as a third W boson, but in

In ref. [12] two of the authors used these W loop, *i.e.* in eq. (2.8), and found a linear tadpole. This is equivalent to using both an improved point coupling (Fig. 3a). For example, if $\tilde{m}_W$ is the vacuum to vacuum W loop generates a tadpole coupling $ig_{\mu\nu} \frac{d\tilde{m}_W^2}{d\phi}$ and improved inverse propagator “figure eight” tadpole as shown in Fig. 3b, and

(since the improved coupling does not vanish at $\bar{\phi} = 0$). It is therefore important to make $\bar{\phi}$ dependent mass renormalizations at the tadpole level [15, 34].

It has been suggested [35, 32] that including the momentum dependence of the plasma masses eliminates the linear term. While it is true that the momentum dependence can be an important correction, any $\bar{\phi}$ dependent mass renormalization, whether or not it also depends on momentum, must be made at the tadpole (or mass, 3-point, etc.) level to avoid overcounting. We believe the linear term found by Shaposhnikov [13] arose from a similar overcounting.

Substituting the improved masses into the propagator in the W tadpole, counting all 3 W's, yields

$$V' = \frac{-3}{2} \frac{g^2 \bar{\phi}}{2} T \sum_n \int \frac{d^3 \mathbf{k}}{(2\pi)^3} \text{Tr} \{P(1 - \Pi P)^{-1}\} \quad (4.6)$$

where $-iP_\mu^\nu(k)$ is the Landau gauge tree-level propagator, and $\Pi_\mu^\nu = \text{diag}(\Pi_0^0, \Pi_i^i, \Pi_i^i, \Pi_i^i)$. This gives

$$V' = \frac{3g^2 \bar{\phi}}{4} T \sum_n \int \frac{d^3 \mathbf{k}}{(2\pi)^3} \left[\frac{3}{k_i^2} - \frac{\mathbf{k}^2 \delta}{k_i^2 (k_n^2 k_i^2 + \mathbf{k}^2 \delta)} \right] \quad (4.7)$$

where $k_n^2 \equiv \mathbf{k}^2 + (2\pi n T)^2$, $k_i^2 = k_n^2 + m_i^2$, and $\delta \equiv \Pi_0^0 - \Pi_i^i = m_0^2 - m_i^2$. The first term in brackets exactly reproduces eq. (2.9) with $\tilde{m} \rightarrow m_i$. The second term, up to renormalizable divergences, is dominated by $n = 0$ and is approximately

$$\frac{3g^2 \bar{\phi}}{4} \frac{T(m_i - m_0)}{4\pi} \quad (4.8)$$

Insofar as $m_i \sim \bar{\phi}$ and $m_0 \sim T$, this term reduces the cubic term in V by 1/3, as expected [15]. In Appendix C we show there is an additional (relatively unimportant) correction:

$$\frac{3g^2 \bar{\phi}}{4} \frac{3\delta}{64\pi^2} [\ln(T^2/M_w^2) + 5.21] \quad (4.9)$$

We next turn to the lollipop diagram (Fig. 1e), with propagators improved to $\mathcal{O}(g^2)$. The contribution of internal $W^\pm$'s to V' is

$$V'_l = \frac{-g^3 M_w}{2} T \sum_n \int \frac{d^3 \mathbf{k}}{(2\pi)^3} T \sum_m \int \frac{d^3 \mathbf{p}}{(2\pi)^3} \frac{1}{[(p_m - k_n)^2 + m_h^2]} \text{Tr} \{P(k)[1 - \Pi P(k)]^{-1} P(p)[1 - \Pi P(p)]^{-1}\} \quad (4.10)$$

There is also a contribution due to the Z. Defer to Appendix C, where the expression is evaluated for $\delta = 0, \infty$.

Finally, we remark on our gauge fixing. Landau gauge - Goldstone boson mixing can be eliminated by a $\bar{\phi}$ dependent gauge for every value of $\bar{\phi}$. Although the potential is not gauge invariant for this [36], it is unnecessary in the case of Landau gauge since the linear term vanishes due to $\partial_\mu A^\mu = 0$.

5 The Higgs sector

It is easy to include the effects of gauge boson tadpoles in the Higgs propagator, since the effective potential is the gap equation at zero external momentum. If V_G is the potential for Higgs bosons and fermions only, then the shifted Higgs mass $m_h^2 = V_G''(\bar{\phi})$. We could solve the gap equation for $\bar{\phi}$ as we did for the gauge sector, giving:

$$\begin{aligned} m_h^2(\bar{\phi}, T) &= V_G''(\bar{\phi}, T) + \frac{\lambda T^2}{4} \left[F_+ \left(\frac{m_h}{T} \right) \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \frac{\lambda^2 \bar{\phi}^2 T}{4} \left[\frac{3}{m_h} F'_+ \left(\frac{m_h}{T} \right) \right] \right] \\ m_\chi^2(\bar{\phi}, T) &= V_G'(\bar{\phi}, T)/\bar{\phi} + \frac{\lambda T^2}{12} \left[F_+ \left(\frac{m_h}{T} \right) \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \frac{\lambda^2 \bar{\phi}^2 T^2}{3(m_h^2 - m_\chi^2)} \left[F_+ \left(\frac{m_h}{T} \right) \right] \right] \end{aligned}$$

However, except for very heavy Higgses these

$$m_h^2(\bar{\phi}, T) = V_G''(\bar{\phi}, T) + \frac{\lambda T^2}{2}, \quad m_\chi^2(\bar{\phi}, T) = V_G'(\bar{\phi}, T)/\bar{\phi}$$

which corresponds to Fig. 2b. These are the tadpoles. Thus, we have summed contributions to the Higgs tadpoles, but only Higgs daisies.

Carrington [14], working to lowest order in g , with V_G'' and $V_G'/\bar{\phi}$ replaced by their values at $\bar{\phi} = 0$,

temperatures the scalar masses appeared real. Our calculation re-introduces imaginary masses; see the discussion following eq. (2.8). Some bumpiness results in our plots where m_h and m_χ pass through zero.

6 Improving the Standard Model effective potential

We first calculate the “1-loop” effective potential. Then we omit the Higgs sector and improve the gauge sector as described in eq. (4.7) and the subsequent paragraph to get V_G . The Higgs sector is then added back in using eq. (5.2) in eq. (2.9), adding the lollipop from Appendix C, and integrating to get the “Super-Daisy” potential, as in Fig. 2c.

For comparison we also show a “Daisy” potential, which differs only in setting $\sigma_0 = \sigma_i = 0$ in eq. (4.3) and eq. (4.4) and omitting the lollipop. A good “Estimate” is obtained by calculating the 1-loop potential with $g_W = 4$, $g_Z = 2$, and $m_h = m_\chi = 0$.

Fig. 4 shows these potentials for various values of the Higgs and top masses (in GeV), including one set matching Carrington’s plots [14]. Each potential is shown at its critical temperature T_1 (i.e. when two vacua are degenerate). V , $\bar{\phi}$, and T are given in units where $v = 1$.

For $\bar{\phi} \gg 2T$ the plasma mass corrections are small, and the 1-loop potential is adequate. The perturbative expansion is still out of control for $g^2 T/m_i > 4\pi$ (where the numerical factor is something of a guess), or roughly $\bar{\phi} < .06 T$ (marked by an arrow on the plots), so even the “Super-Daisy” potential is not to be trusted far to the left of the arrow. This is about a factor of 2 closer to the origin than the corresponding cutoff for the “Daisy” potential, $\bar{\phi} < .10 T$ [14]. Indeed we see that for $M_h > 75$ GeV the “Daisy” and “Super-Daisy” potentials differ significantly.

We plot $\phi_+(T_1)/T_1$ (which closely approximates $\phi_+(T_b)/T_b$) vs. M_h for several values of M_t in Fig. 5. For comparison we show values from both Carrington [14] Fig. 14 (with $M_t = 110$ GeV), and Dine *et al.* Fig. 5 ($M_t = 120$ GeV); in the latter case we converted their results at T_b (which they call T_t for “tunneling”)

using the quartic potential relation

$$\frac{\phi_+(T_1)}{T_1} = \frac{\phi_+(T_b)}{T_b} \left[\frac{4}{3 + \sqrt{1 + 8\epsilon_b}} \right]$$

and took ϵ_b from their Fig. 6. For a light Higgs, (see Fig. 4), all the results agree closely. As T order corrections appear to lower $\phi_+(T_1)/T_1$. Irrelevant for heavier Higgses. Since $\phi_+(T_1)/T_1$ is allowed Higgs and top masses, we see the EWSB to drive baryogenesis.

7 Saddlepoints and the effective potential

While the effective potential suffices to determine the full action Γ [see eq. (2.2)] is needed to determine the full system, such as the rates for bubble nucleation. For extremal configurations such as critical bubble configurations $\Gamma[\bar{\phi}] = W[0]$ is gauge invariant [37], so derivative corrections are gauge dependence of V .

We can use Chan’s derivative expansion [38] to include derivative corrections. Since the finite temperature effective potential is the same equations as the zero temperature effective potential conditions, we may formally express $G(x, y)$, in

$$G(x, y) = T \sum_n \int \frac{d^3 p}{(2\pi)^3} e^{ip \cdot y} [-\partial^2 + U(x)]^{-1}$$

where $U(x)$ is the mass of the field in question including derivative corrections. Following Chan’s technique, we write the expansion in even powers of derivatives:

$$\begin{aligned} G(x, x) &= T \sum_n \int \frac{d^3 k}{(2\pi)^3} [k^2 + U(x + i\epsilon)]^{-1} \\ &= T \sum_n \int \frac{d^3 k}{(2\pi)^3} [k^2 + U(x)]^{-1} \\ &\quad \left[i \frac{\partial}{\partial k_{j_1}} \dots i \frac{\partial}{\partial k_{j_q}} \right] [p^2 + U(x)]^{-1} \end{aligned}$$

Figure 4: 1-Loop, Daisy, Super-Daisy

Figure 5: ϕ_+/T_1 vs. M_h

The contribution to the spatial part of the kinetic energy arises from the $m = 1, q = 2$ and $m = 2, q = 1$ terms in the above sum. Taking only the dominant $n = 0$ part of the frequency sum gives

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{L}_{eff} &\ni \int \delta U(x) G(x, x) \\ &= \frac{-g_j T}{384\pi} U^{-3/2} (U')^2 (\partial_i \bar{\phi})^2 = \frac{-1}{64\pi} \frac{g^2 T}{(g\bar{\phi}/2)} (\partial_i \bar{\phi})^2\end{aligned}\quad (7.3)$$

where $U = m_j^2(\bar{\phi})$, and ∂_i is a spatial derivative. We have inserted values for the tree level W mass in the second expression, corresponding to the $\mathbf{p}^2$ term of the penultimate diagram in Fig. 2b.

The form is as expected by naive power counting of a one loop graph with two external legs, both carrying nonzero momentum. Since this $\mathcal{O}(g)$ contribution is numerically small, one might think derivative corrections are unimportant. That this may *not* be the case is indicated by the calculation of the $\mathcal{O}(g^2)$ graph in Fig. 6.

This graph arises in the derivative expansion from a shifting of G^{-1} due to

Figure 6: Momentum-dependent Higgs

mixing which we previously ignored. Its contribution to the real part of the Higgs self-energy, with real external momentum p_0 , is

$$\begin{aligned}\Pi(p_0, \mathbf{p}) &= 3g^2 T \sum_n \int \frac{d^3 \mathbf{k}}{(2\pi)^3} \frac{p^2 - k^2}{(k^2 + m_W^2)[(p-k)^2 + m_\chi^2]} \\ &= 3g^2 \left\{ \left[\frac{5}{8} p^2 + \frac{m_\chi^2 - m_W^2}{8} \right] L\left(\frac{m_W^2 - m_\chi^2}{2}; p_0, \mathbf{p}\right) \right. \\ &\quad + \left[\frac{m_\chi^2}{8} - \frac{3}{8} p^2 \right] L\left(\frac{-p^2 - m_\chi^2}{2}; p_0, \mathbf{p}\right) \\ &\quad - \left[\frac{(p^2 - m_\chi^2)^2}{8m_W^2} \right] L\left(\frac{p^2 - m_\chi^2}{2}; p_0, \mathbf{p}\right) \\ &\quad + \left[\frac{(p^2 - m_\chi^2 + m_W^2)^2}{8m_W^2} - \frac{1}{2} p^2 \right] L\left(\frac{p^2 + m_W^2}{2}; p_0, \mathbf{p}\right) \\ &\quad + \left[\frac{p^4 + m_\chi^2(m_\chi^2 - m_W^2) + p^2(3m_W^2 - m_\chi^2)}{16(p^2 + m_\chi^2 - \frac{m_W^2}{2})} \right. \\ &\quad \left. + L(0; -p_0, \mathbf{p}) \right] \} + \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{m^2}{T^2}\right)\end{aligned}$$

in which

$$L(m^2; p_0, \mathbf{p}) = \int_0^\infty \frac{dk}{2\mathbf{p}(2\pi)^2} [F_k \ln \left| \frac{k(\mathbf{p} - p_0) - m^2}{k(\mathbf{p} + p_0) - m^2} \right|]$$

and $\mathbf{p}$ is the magnitude of the external momentum.

The integral has been computed previously [15]. The algebraic correction, it gives

$$L(m^2; p_0, \mathbf{p}) = \frac{T}{8\mathbf{p}} \theta(-p^2) \text{sign}(-m^2)$$

$$+ \frac{m^2}{4\pi^2 p^2} \left[\frac{p_0}{2\mathbf{p}} \ln \left| \frac{p_0 + \mathbf{p}}{p_0 - \mathbf{p}} \right| + \gamma_{\text{Euler}} - 1 + \frac{1}{2} \ln \frac{M_W^2}{4\pi^2 T^2} \right] \quad (7.6)$$

where M_W is our subtraction point, and $\text{sign}(0) = 0$. The analytic behavior of this diagram [note the strange $T/\mathbf{p}$ behavior of $L(m^2; p_0, \mathbf{p})$] is sensitive to the scheme one uses to continue from imaginary to real external momentum. Our continuation prescription is consistent with previous work [31, 38], but there are other methods [39]. The $p_0 = 0, \mathbf{p} \neq 0$ behavior, which characterizes saddlepoint solutions, may be altered if our prescription turns out to be incorrect.

8 Conclusion

Much recent work on the EWPT [12, 13, 14, 15, 32] has concentrated on improving the calculation of V . We now believe there is no linear term, and that the propagator improvement performed in ref. [14] and estimated in ref. [15] is essentially correct for the gauge sector to $\mathcal{O}(g^3)$. The main result of these corrections is to screen the longitudinal mode, decreasing the cubic term E by a factor of 1/3 and making the transition more weakly first-order.

In this paper we have included higher order corrections not previously considered, specifically those from subleading parts of daisy graphs, gauge superdaisies, gauge superdaisies in the Higgs sector, and the “lollipop” diagram. We estimated the effect on the effective potential of using momentum-dependent self-energies, and computed the $\mathcal{O}(g^2)$ derivative corrections to the effective action. The results of our effective potential computations are similar to those of [14, 15] for a light Higgs ($M_h \leq 75 \text{ GeV}$), but show an even further weakening of the transition for a heavier Higgs ($75 \text{ GeV} < M_h < 125 \text{ GeV}$). Above 125 GeV our expansion becomes less reliable.

Evans [32] has criticized all recent calculations of the electroweak effective potential on the grounds that propagator resummations have been performed at zero external momentum, rather than on-shell. We find that although this approximation does lead to errors (as pointed out in our earlier preprint [12]), they are unlikely to lead to any qualitative changes in the behavior of the potential.

Derivative corrections to the effective action may be important, however. For example, if the diagram in Fig. 6 is indicative, they could significantly alter bounce solutions when typical spatial frequencies are less than about $T/8$.

Estimates of bubble wall thicknesses are often corrections to the gauge boson effective action coefficients. We hope to examine derivative corrections and other effects in the future [30].

To summarize, a computation of V in a gauge theory is subject to uncontrolled infrared corrections from the Higgs sector. These are included in both the gauge and Higgs self-energies. Our results are reliable for $\bar{\phi} > gT/10$. We have computed the effective potential compared the results to previous estimates. At high energies are reliable, the Standard Model (even with Higgs) is still inadequate to generate the baryon asymmetry.

9 Acknowledgments

The authors would like to thank Greg Anderson, Michael Dine, Thomas Gould, Lawrence H. Green, Ann Nelson, Stamatis Vokos, Erick Weinberg, and others for discussions. DEB acknowledges support from the DOE under Contract DEAC-03-81ER40050, and the University of Texas at Austin for its hospitality during part of this work. Support from the National Science Foundation under grant DMR-00-70905, the state of Texas under grant TNRLC-RGFY1-00-0000000000 of Fellows. CGB acknowledges support from the DOE under Contract DEFG-02-90ER40560, as well as the University of Texas at Austin under grant NSF-PHY-91-23780.

10 Appendix A: Standard Model f_j 's and Π 's

The functions $f_j(r)$ defined in eq. (2.6) are (to 1-loop)

$$\begin{aligned}
f_h(1) &= 18(\pi/\sqrt{3} - 2) \\
f_\chi(r) &= \frac{8\lambda^2 v^4}{M_\chi^4} [\ln(r) + i\pi - 2] \\
f_t(r) &= \frac{4(4-r)^2}{\sqrt{4r-r^2}} \tan^{-1}\left(\frac{r}{\sqrt{4r-r^2}}\right) - 16 + 2r \\
f_W(r) = f_Z(r) &= \frac{4}{3} \sqrt{\frac{4-r}{r}} (r^2 - 4r + 12) \tan^{-1}\left(\frac{r}{\sqrt{4r-r^2}}\right) + \\
&\quad \frac{4(1-r)^3}{3r} \ln(1-r) - \frac{44}{3} + \frac{2r^2}{3} (\ln(r) - i\pi) \quad (10.1)
\end{aligned}$$

Note the imaginary part of f_χ (representing the amplitude for a Higgs to decay to Goldstone bosons in the ungauged theory) is exactly canceled by a term in $f_{W,Z}$. For large r , the leading results for the top and the gauge bosons (corresponding to taking $\Sigma(M_h^2) - \Sigma(0) = M_h^2 \Sigma'(0)$) are

$$f_t(r) \approx -10r/3, \quad f_W(r) = f_Z(r) \approx -10r/3 \quad (10.2)$$

The electric and magnetic plasma masses for the $W^\pm$ from Fig. 2a are:

$$\begin{aligned}
\Pi_0^0(W^\pm) &= \frac{g^2 T^2}{3} \left[2 + \frac{1}{2} + \frac{12}{4} \right] - \frac{g^2 T}{2\pi} \left[m_W + c_w^2 m_Z + s_w^2 m_\gamma + \frac{m_h + 3m_\chi}{8} \right] \\
&\quad - \frac{g^4 \phi^2 T}{16\pi} \left[\frac{1}{m_h + m_W} + \frac{s_w^2}{m_\chi + m_\gamma} + \frac{s_w^4/c_w^2}{m_\chi + m_Z} \right] \\
\Pi_i^i(W^\pm) &= \frac{g^2 T}{\pi} \left[\frac{-7}{12} (m_W + c_w^2 m_Z + s_w^2 m_\gamma) + c_w^2 \frac{m_Z^3 - m_W^3}{m_Z^2 - m_W^2} + s_w^2 \frac{m_W^3 - m_\gamma^3}{m_W^2 - m_\gamma^2} \right. \\
&\quad \left. - \frac{m_h + m_\chi}{16} + \frac{1}{12} \frac{m_h^3 - m_\chi^3}{m_h^2 - m_\chi^2} \right] \\
&\quad - \frac{g^4 \phi^2 T}{24\pi} \left[\frac{1}{m_h + m_W} + \frac{s_w^2}{m_\chi + m_\gamma} + \frac{s_w^4/c_w^2}{m_\chi + m_Z} \right] \quad (10.3)
\end{aligned}$$

The three numbers in brackets in the first term of Π_0^0 reflect contributions from the gauge sector, the Higgs sector, and 12 fermionic isospin doublets, respectively.

The analogous formulas for the Z^0 are

$$\begin{aligned}
\Pi_0^0(Z^0) &= \frac{g^2 T^2}{3} \left[2c_w^2 + \frac{1}{2} \frac{1 - 2s_w^2}{c_w^2} \right] \\
&\quad - \frac{g^2 T}{2\pi} \left[2c_w^2 m_W + \frac{m_h + m_\chi}{16c_w^2} \right] \\
&\quad - \frac{g^4 \phi^2 T}{16\pi} \left[\frac{1/c_w^4}{m_h + m_Z} + \frac{2}{m_\chi} \right] \\
\Pi_i^i(Z^0) &= \frac{g^2 T}{\pi} \left[\frac{c_w^2}{3} m_W - \frac{m_h + m_\chi}{16c_w^2} \right] \\
&\quad - \frac{g^4 \phi^2 T}{24\pi} \left[\frac{1/c_w^4}{m_h + m_Z} + \frac{2}{m_\chi} \right]
\end{aligned}$$

and for the photon

$$\begin{aligned}
\Pi_0^0(\gamma) &= \frac{e^2 T^2}{3} [2 + 1 + 12] - \frac{e^2 T}{2\pi} [2m_\gamma] \\
\Pi_i^i(\gamma) &= \frac{e^2 T}{\pi} \left[\frac{1}{3} m_W \right] - \frac{e^2 g^2 \phi^2 T}{12\pi (m_\chi + m_Z)}
\end{aligned}$$

To simplify things, we take $s_w \rightarrow 0$ (with the former approximation introduces an error of $\mathcal{O}(s_w)$ solutions, which we neglect. Then the $W^\pm$ and

$$\Pi_0^0 \approx \frac{11g^2 T^2}{6} - \frac{5g^2 T}{4\pi} m_W,$$

which gives eq. (4.5).

11 Appendix B: Numerical approximations for $I_{\pm}$

The following approximations [5, 4, 41, 42] to $I_{\pm}$ [see eq. (2.8) and the following paragraph] are accurate to 10^{-4} :

$$I_+(y < 1) \approx \frac{-\pi^4}{45} + \frac{\pi^2}{12}y^2 - \frac{\pi}{6}y^3 - \frac{y^4}{32}(\ln y^2 - 5.4076) + .00031y^6 \quad (11.1)$$

$$I_-(y < 1) \approx \frac{-7\pi^4}{360} + \frac{\pi^2}{24}y^2 + \frac{y^4}{32}(\ln y^2 - 2.6350) - .00214y^6 \quad (11.2)$$

$$\begin{aligned} I_+(i(y < 1)) \approx & \frac{-\pi^4}{45} - \frac{\pi^2}{12}y^2 + y^3 \left[\frac{4}{9} - \frac{1}{3} \ln(2y) \right] - \frac{y^4}{32}(\ln y^2 - 5.4076) \\ & + \frac{y^5}{180} - .00029y^6 \end{aligned} \quad (11.3)$$

$$I_+(y > 1) = - \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{y^2 K_2(ny)}{n^2} \quad (11.4)$$

$$I_-(y > 1) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} (-1)^n \frac{y^2 K_2(ny)}{n^2} \quad (11.5)$$

$$\begin{aligned} I_+(i(y > 1)) = & \sum_{n=1}^{[8/y]} \left\{ \frac{y^3}{3n} - \frac{\pi y^2}{2n^2} [\mathbf{H}_2(ny) - Y_2(ny)] \right\} \\ & + \frac{y}{\pi} \sum_{j=0}^4 \left\{ \left[\zeta(2j+3) - \sum_{n=1}^{[8/y]} n^{-(2j+3)} \right] \left[\frac{-4}{y^2} \right]^j \Gamma(j + \frac{3}{2}) \Gamma(j - \frac{1}{2}) \right\} \end{aligned} \quad (11.6)$$

where K and Y are Bessel functions, $\mathbf{H}$ is the Struve function, ζ is the Riemann zeta function, $[x]$ is the greatest integer less than or equal to x , and infinite sums are terminated when the desired accuracy is achieved.

We note that the $\phi^4 \ln \phi^2$ terms which come from $I_{\pm}(g\phi/T)$ and those which come from the $T=0$ potential cancel.

12 Appendix C: Gauge tadpole

We may rewrite eq. (4.7) as

$$V' = \frac{3g^2\bar{\phi}}{4} T \sum_n \int \frac{d^3\mathbf{k}}{(2\pi)^3} \left[\frac{2}{k_i^2} \right]$$

and evaluate the sum with the usual contour then becomes

$$\frac{3g^2\bar{\phi}}{4} \int \frac{d^3k}{(2\pi)^3} \left[\frac{k_+ + k_- + \frac{m_i^2}{\Delta}(k_- - k_+)}{4\sqrt{k^4 + m_0^2 k^2}} + \frac{m_i^2}{2\Delta} \right]$$

where $\Delta = \sqrt{m_i^4 - 4\delta k^2}$, $k_{\pm} = \sqrt{k^2 + \frac{m_i^2}{2} \pm \frac{\Delta}{2}}$

After renormalization, eq. (12.2) is well ap

$$\frac{m_i^2}{16\pi^2} \left[\ln \frac{m_i^2}{M_w^2} - .39 \right] + \frac{3\delta}{64\pi^2} \left[\ln \frac{T^2}{M_w^2} + 5.21 \right] + \dots$$

Note that although the $k_{\pm}$ can be complex, the

The lollipop, eq. (4.10), has been evaluated with unimproved propagators. In Landau gauge. For static self energies,

$$\text{Tr} \{ P(k)[1 - \Pi P(k)]^{-1} P(p)[1 - \Pi P(p)]^{-1} \} =$$

where $p_i^2 = p_m^2 + m_i^2$ and

$$X = (k_n \cdot p_m)^2 \frac{k_{\delta}^4 \mathbf{p}^2 + p_{\delta} \mathbf{k}^2 - \mathbf{k}^2 \mathbf{p}^2 \delta}{k_n^2 k_i^2 k_{\delta}^4 p_n^2 p_i^4 p_{\delta}^4} + (\mathbf{k}^2 \mathbf{p}^2 \delta)$$

in which $k_{\delta}^4 = k_n^2 k_i^2 + \mathbf{k}^2 \delta$.

The frequency sums can be evaluated by using $g(p; k)/[(p-k)^2 - m^2]$, $p_0 = 2\pi i n T$, and $g(p, k)$ the contribution from the pole is

$$T \sum_m \int \frac{d^3\mathbf{p}}{(2\pi)^3} f(p) = - \int \frac{d^4p}{(2\pi)^3} \text{sign}(p_0) \delta(p)$$

For $k_0 = 2\pi i m T$ (i.e., an internal momentum), $F_{p_0+k_0} = F_{p_0}$. This formula should be applied to each pole in eq. (12.4).

Temperature-dependent infinities are canceled by graphs analogous to the lollipop, but with insertions of zero temperature counterterms. The finite part of eq. (4.10) is, for $\delta = 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} V'_l = & \frac{g^3 M_w}{2} \left\{ (3/2 - \frac{m_h^2(m_i^2 + m_h^2)}{2m_i^4}) A(\frac{m^2}{2}) + \frac{(m_i^2 - m_h^2)^2}{2m_i^4} A(\frac{m_h^2 - m_i^2}{2}) \right. \\ & - (3/4 + \frac{m_h^4}{4m_i^4}) A(\frac{m_h^2 + m_i^2}{2}) \\ & \left. + (\frac{m_h^2}{2m_i^2} - \frac{m_h^4}{8m_i^4} - 3/2) A(\frac{m_h^2 - 2m_i^2}{2}) \right\} \end{aligned} \quad (12.7)$$

where

$$A(m) = \int_0^\infty \frac{dk dp}{(2\pi)^4} F_{k_0} F_{p_0} \ln \left| \frac{m^2 - 2pk}{m^2 + 2pk} \right| \quad (12.8)$$

$$\approx 3.11 \cdot 10^{-5} T^2 (\ln \frac{m^2}{T^2} - 1) \quad (12.9)$$

For $\delta \rightarrow \infty$,

$$V'_l = \frac{g^3 M_w}{2} [B(m_h^2, \frac{m_h^2}{2}) - \frac{1}{2} B(m_i^2, \frac{m_h^2 - 2m_i^2}{2})] \quad (12.10)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} B(m^2, M^2) = & \int_0^\infty \frac{dk dp}{(2\pi)^4} F_a F_b \frac{kp}{2ab} \left\{ \frac{4M^2}{kp} \right. \\ & + [1 + \frac{(M^2 - ab)^2}{k^2 p^2}] \ln \left| \frac{kp + M^2 - ab}{kp - M^2 + ab} \right| \\ & \left. + [1 + \frac{(M^2 + ab)^2}{k^2 p^2}] \ln \left| \frac{kp + M^2 + ab}{kp - M^2 - ab} \right| \right\} \end{aligned} \quad (12.11)$$

and $a^2 = k^2 + m_i^2$, $b^2 = p^2 + m^2$. A numerical approximation to eq. (12.10) is

$$V'_l \approx \frac{g^3 M_w}{2} .002 T^2 \left[\frac{m_h}{m_i} e^{-.9(m_h + m_i)/T} - \frac{m_h^2 - 2m_i^2}{2m_i^2} e^{-1.8m_i/T} \right] \quad (12.12)$$

We use $\delta = \infty$ in all plots in this paper.

References

- [1] M. Dine, P. Huet, R. Singleton Jr. & L. S. (1991);
M. Dine, P. Huet & R. Singleton Jr., *SCD*
- [2] M.E. Shaposhnikov, *Nucl. Phys.* **B287**, 7 (1987);
A.I. Bochkarev & M.E. Shaposhnikov, *M* (1987);
L. McLerran, M. Shaposhnikov, N. Turok & (1991);
A. Cohen, D. Kaplan and A. Nelson, *Phys. Lett.* **B349**, 727 (1991); & *Nucl. Phys.* **B349**, 727 (1991);
- [3] A.D. Sakharov, *JETP Lett.* **5**, 24 (1967).
- [4] G.W. Anderson & L.J. Hall, *Phys. Rev.* **D19**, 939 (1979).
- [5] L. Dolan & R. Jackiw, *Phys. Rev.* **D9**, 3357 (1974).
- [6] S. Weinberg, *Phys. Rev.* **D9**, 3357 (1974).
- [7] A.D. Linde, *Nucl. Phys.* **B216**, 421 (1983).
- [8] ALEPH Collaboration, CERN-PPE/91-113; *Physics Reports*;
ALEPH Collaboration, CERN-PPE/91-113; *Physics Reports* **204**, 263 (1991).
- [9] S. Weinberg, "Critical Phenomena for Finite Temperature Field Theory", *Physics 1976*:1.
- [10] A.Linde, *Phys. Lett.* **B96**, 289 (1980);
J. Kapusta, *Finite Temperature Field Theory* (1989).
- [11] P. Fendley, *Phys. Lett.* **B196**, 175 (1987).
- [12] D.E. Brahm & S.D.H. Hsu, CALT-68-170 (1988).
- [13] M.E. Shaposhnikov, *Phys. Lett.* **B277**, 375 (1991).

- [14] M.E. Carrington, *Phys. Rev.* **D45**, 2933 (1992).
- [15] M. Dine, R.G. Leigh, P. Huet, A. Linde & D. Linde, SLAC-PUB-5740 / SCIPP-92-06 / SU-ITP-92-6 (Feb. 1992); SLAC-PUB-5741 / SCIPP-92-07 / SU-ITP-92-7 (Mar. 1992);
- [16] P. Arnold, private communication.
- [17] L.-H. Chan, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **54**, 1222 (1985); *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **56**, 404 (1986) (Errata).
- [18] F.R. Klinkhamer & N.S. Manton, *Phys. Rev.* **D30**, 2212 (1984); P. Arnold & L. McLerran, *Phys. Rev.* **D36**, 581 (1987).
- [19] A. Dannenberg, *Phys. Lett.* **B202**, 110 (1988); G. Slade, *Comm. Math. Phys.* **102**, 425 (1985); G. Slade, *Comm. Math. Phys.* **104**, 573 (1986); S. Norimatsu, *Phys. Rev.* **D35**, 2009 (1987).
- [20] E.J. Weinberg & A. Wu, *Phys. Rev.* **D36**, 2474 (1987).
- [21] M. Sher, *Phys. Rev.* **179**, 273 (1989).
- [22] R. Brandenberger, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **57**, 1 (1985); A.D. Linde, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **42**, 389 (1979); S. Coleman, *Aspects of Symmetry* (Cambridge University Press, 1985); R.J. Rivers, *Path Integral Methods in Quantum Field Theory* (Cambridge, 1987), pp. 235–288.
- [23] I.J.R. Aitchison & C.M. Fraser, *Ann. Phys.* **156**, 1 (1984).
- [24] S. Coleman & E. Weinberg, *Phys. Rev.* **D7**, 1888 (1973).
- [25] D.A. Kirzhnits & A.D. Linde, *Phys. Lett.* **B42**, 472 (1972).
- [26] D.E. Brahm, CALT-68-1797 (June 1992), to appear in *Proceedings, Yale Workshop on Baryon Number Violation at the Electroweak Scale (Mar. 1992)* (World Scientific); D.E. Brahm, C.L.Y. Lee, & S.D.H. Hsu, unpublished.
- [27] G. Anderson, private communication.
- [28] S.Y. Lee & A.M. Sciaccaluga, *Nucl. Phys.*
- [29] R. Jackiw, *Phys. Rev.* **D9**, 1686 (1974); J. Iliopoulos, C. Itzykson & A. Martin, *Phys. Rev. D*
- [30] C.G. Boyd, D.E. Brahm, S.D.H. Hsu & S.
- [31] H.A. Weldon, *Phys. Rev.* **D26**, 1394 (1982).
- [32] T.S. Evans, Imperial/TP/91-92/23 (Apr. 1992).
- [33] D.J. Gross, R.D. Pisarski & L.G. Yaffe, A.D. Linde, *Phys. Lett.* **B93**, 327 (1980); N.P. Landsman, *Physica* **A158**, 220 (1989).
- [34] A.D. Linde, private communication.
- [35] P. Arnold, UW/PT-92-06, NUHEP-TH-92-06.
- [36] L. Dolan & R. Jackiw, *Phys. Rev.* **D9**, 1327 (1974); L. Dolan & R. Jackiw, *Phys. Rev.* **D9**, 2816 (1974).
- [37] R. Kobes *et.al.*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **64**, 299 (1990); R. Kobes *et.al.*, *Nucl. Phys.* **B355**, 1 (1991).
- [38] H.A. Weldon, *Phys. Rev.* **D28**, 2007 (1983).
- [39] P.S. Gribovsky & B.R. Holstein, *Z. Phys.* **25**, 147 (1978); P.F. Bedaque & A. Das, *Phys. Rev.* **D45**, 1213 (1992).
- [40] B.H. Liu, L. McLerran, & N. Turok, TPI-92-06.
- [41] G.W. Anderson, *Phys. Lett.* **B243**, 265 (1990).
- [42] H. Haber & H.A. Weldon, *J. Math. Phys.* **13**, 212 (1972).
- [43] P. Arnold, E. Braaten & S. Vokos, ANL-91-22 (Dec. 1991).